

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended. No claims have been added. Claims 2 and 10 have been canceled. Thus, claims 1, 3-9, and 11-24 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11-14 and 17-22 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0224855 of Cunningham (*Cunningham*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,160,804 of Ahmed, et al. (*Ahmed*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11-14 and 17-22 are not rendered obvious by *Cunningham* and *Ahmed*.

Claim 1 recites:

selecting one of a plurality of location modules based on the static information and the dynamic information, each of the plurality of location modules comprising an appropriate methodology to dynamically determine the mobile node's location with respect to a corporate demilitarized zone ("DMZ") wherein the plurality of location modules include a first location module for frequent roaming across the corporate DMZ, and a second location module to utilize a Dynamic Host Control Protocol ("DHCP") reply to determine the location of the mobile node, or a third location module to utilize a care of address ("COA") assigned by a DHCP server to determine the location of the mobile node...

Thus, Applicants claim selection between a plurality of location modules based on both static and dynamic information related to the mobile node. The location modules include at least one corresponding to frequent roaming across a corporate DMZ, at least one that utilizes a DHCP reply and at least one that utilizes a COA assigned by the DHCP server.

Cunningham discloses dynamically detecting a location of a mobile node.

However, *Cunningham* does not disclose multiple location modules including at least one corresponding to frequent roaming across a corporate DMZ, at least one that utilizes a DHCP reply and at least one that utilizes a COA assigned by the DHCP server. *Ahmed* discloses location management and tracking of mobile devices. However, *Ahmed* does not disclose multiple location modules including at least one corresponding to frequent roaming across a corporate DMZ, at least one that utilizes a DHCP reply and at least one that utilizes a COA assigned by the DHCP server. Because neither *Cunningham* nor *Ahmed* teach or suggest multiple location modules including at least one corresponding to frequent roaming across a corporate DMZ, at least one that utilizes a DHCP reply and at least one that utilizes a COA assigned by the DHCP server, no combination of *Cunningham* and *Ahmed* can teach or suggest the independent claims.

Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that the dependent claims are not rendered obvious by *Cunningham* and *Ahmed* for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims.

Claims 7, 15 and 23 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Cunningham* in view of *Leung* and further in view of *Kakemizu*. Each of claims 7, 15 and 23 is a dependent claim that depends from an independent claims discussed above. None of the cited referenced teaches or suggests multiple location modules including at least one corresponding to frequent roaming across a corporate DMZ, at least one that utilizes a DHCP reply and at least one that utilizes a COA assigned by the DHCP server.

Therefore, the deficiencies set forth above are not cured by this combination of references. Accordingly, claims 7, 15 and 23 cannot be rendered obvious by the proposed combination of cited references.

Claims 8, 16 and 24 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Cunningham* in view of *Leung* and further in view of *Mukaoka*. Each of claims 7, 15 and 23 is a dependent claim that depends from an independent claims discussed above. None of the cited referenced teaches or suggests multiple location modules including at least one corresponding to frequent roaming across a corporate DMZ, at least one that utilizes a DHCP reply and at least one that utilizes a COA assigned by the DHCP server. Therefore, the deficiencies set forth above are not cured by this combination of references. Accordingly, claims 8, 16 and 24 cannot be rendered obvious by the proposed combination of cited references.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1, 3-9 and 11-24 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: February 27, 2008

/Paul A. Mendonsa/

Paul A. Mendonsa

Reg. No. 42,879

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778